They worked in fields picking cotton, tobacco and crops just as the slaves.

Caribbean immigrants have been contributing to the well-being of American society since its founding. Alexander Hamilton, the First Secretary of the Treasury was from the Caribbean island of St. Kitts. We count among our famous sons and daughters, Secretary of State Colin Powell, Cicely Tyson, W.E.B. Dubois, James Weldon Johnson, Harry Belafonte and Sidney Poitier to name a few.

H. Con. Res. 127 recognizes the significance of Caribbean people and their descendants in the history and culture of the United States. Our nation would not be what it is today without these significant contributions of the Caribbean people and we should honor these accomplishments with the passing of this legislation. The contributions of Caribbean-Americans are a significant part of the history, progress, and heritage of the United States and play an important role in shaping the ethnic and racial diversity of the United States, which ultimately enriches and strengthens our nation.

By passing this legislation we continue to honor the friendship between the United States and Caribbean countries. We are united by our common values and shared history, and we should celebrate the rich Caribbean Heritage and the many ways in which Caribbean Americans have helped shape this nation.

I urge my colleagues to support this resolution to pay tribute to the common culture and bonds of friendship that unite the United States and the Caribbean countries.

AMERICAN CLEAN ENERGY AND SECURITY ACT OF 2009

SPEECH OF

HON. HENRY A. WAXMAN

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, June 26, 2009

Mr. WAXMAN. Madam Speaker, today, as we discuss comprehensive energy and climate legislation, our focus is on how we can lower the carbon footprint of electricity generation.

As we move to a clean energy future, however, the country still needs to make progress in reducing sulfur dioxide, nitrogen oxides, and mercury emissions, air pollutants that cause acid rain, ground-level ozone, particulate matter pollution, and mercury contamination.

In developing their strategies to reduce carbon dioxide, electricity generators will still need to take into account the need to reduce emissions of these conventional air pollutants.

For many years, Congressman MCHUGH has worked to tackle the problems created by emissions of such pollutants. In particular, he has shown great leadership in his work to address acid rain and mercury pollution from power plants, as demonstrated by his bill H.R. 1841, the findings of which persuasively demonstrate the case for a strong control program for sulfur dioxide, nitrogen oxides and mercury emissions from power plants.

Putting in place strategies to reduce carbon dioxide emissions will also help address these problems. Mr. MCHUGH's amendment to the American Clean Energy and Security Act does important work by making this link explicit.

It directs EPA to study what effects strategies and technologies that will reduce emissions of carbon dioxide will have on emissions of conventional pollutants like SO_x, NO_x, and mercury.

Further understanding of this interaction between carbon control strategies and the reduction of criteria pollutants will be of clear benefit to policymakers, air quality planners, and the power sector.

Adopting approaches that reduce both types of pollutants would represent a major step forward towards cleaner coal use, and Mr. MCHUGH's amendment will result in important information on what we know now, and what steps should be taken next, in order to achieve this objective.

I also wish to address the purpose of the intellectual property protection provisions in Title IV, Subtitle D, which are to ensure that funding for international climate change mitigation promotes robust compliance with and enforcement of intellectual property rights for clean technology. The intent of the provisions is to safeguard intellectual property rights in order to support investment in the research and development necessary to design and deploy new technologies. For the purposes of this section, clean technologies are any technologies or services relating to the qualifying activities enumerated in section 445.

Section 446 would prohibit bilateral assistance for the benefit of qualifying activities that would undermine compliance with and enforcement of intellectual property rights for clean technology as provided in the World Trade Organization's Agreement on Trade-Related Aspects of Intellectual Property Rights (TRIPS) and applicable bilateral Free Trade Agreements. With regard to multilateral assistance, the provision directs the President to seek to ensure that any climate change mitigation assistance disbursed through a multilateral framework not be permitted for any activity that on its own or in connection to a related activity would undermine intellectual property rights for clean technology, as provided in TRIPS. The objective is to prevent funds from being spent to support the export of a technology where the underlying patent or other intellectual property rights would be undermined as a result of the project. The objective is also to ensure that decisions about individual projects also scrutinize whether related activities have undermined intellectual property rights for clean technology. For example, a funding decision for a project involving the export of wind technology should take into account whether there is a history of intellectual property violations in similar projects involving solar energy technology or technology to support capture and sequestration of carbon dioxide emissions.

An annual assessment of compliance with and enforcement of intellectual property rights would be made by the interagency group established in section 443.

Madam Speaker, I also wish to address some unwarranted concerns that have been raised by misreadings of provisions in H.R. 2454.

In new Section 811 of the Clean Air Act, the Administrator is required to publish an inventory of categories of stationary sources that includes each source category that is responsible for at least 10 percent of the uncapped methane emissions in 2005. The provision goes on to provide that the inventory shall not include sources of enteric fermentation. Thus, emissions from enteric fermentation shall be included in the calculation of uncapped methane emissions in 2005, but enteric fermentation shall be not listed as a source category on the inventory.

I would also like to clear up some confusion on the covered entity definition in new section 700(13)(C) of the Clean Air Act. Under this provision, an entity that produces or imports any of the specified greenhouse gases for sale or distribution in interstate commerce in the specified amount is a covered entity. It has been suggested that somehow this provision might be interpreted so that beef producers would be covered because they produce beef for sale or distribution in interstate commerce because, in the production of beef, they produce manure as a byproduct that is not intended for sale or distribution in interstate commerce. This would be an impermissible reading of section 700(13)(C).

In addition, I would like to clarify that, contrary to claims made by the opponents of the building efficiency provisions, the building labeling provisions of Section 204 establish a voluntary program and are not mandatory requirements. This program is voluntary for the states to choose to implement once EPA produces a prototype label, and it is voluntary for building owners to utilize subject to state policy. Its sole purpose is to provide information to consumers about building energy performance. It is also limited to new construction. There is nothing in the bill, and never has been, that would provide a basis for assertions that homeowners would be required to pay for an expensive audit and upgrades to a home before being allowed to sell it.

I know that those outdoor lighting manufacturers, efficiency groups, and lighting consumer interests who are involved in the ongoing negotiations to reach new consensus efficiency standards for outdoor lighting may be concerned about amendments to the bill's language with regard to those standards. Their efforts provided the basis for the outdoor lighting provisions in the legislation as introduced, and I remain supportive of their ongoing negotiations. It's my hope and expectation that their process will yield a negotiated standard with as much consensus as possible that will deliver substantial energy savings from outdoor lighting products on a realistic schedule. Such a result could be very influential as Congress continues to consider this matter.

DEFENSE AUTHORIZATION ACT, H.R. 2647

HON. ALAN GRAYSON

OF FLORIDA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, July 13, 2009

Mr. GRAYSON. Mr. Chair, amendment 106 to the Defense Authorization Act, H.R. 2647, requires a justification for the use of factors other than cost or price as predominant factors in evaluating competitive proposals for defense procurement contracts. The intent of this provision is to mandate that officials of the Department of Defense weight cost or price as the predominant factor in solicitations for defense procurement contracts, with only occasional and well-justified exceptions.

This amendment requires quantification of the relative weight of evaluation factors in the evaluation scheme, insofar as this is necessary to ensure compliance with the amendment.